

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 10, 2004. Claims 1, 21, and 31-53 are currently pending in this application. As indicated above, Claims 1 and 21 have been amended, Claims 2-20 and 22-30 have been cancelled without prejudice, and Claims 31-53 have been newly added.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Dahlman et al.* (U.S. 6,339,646) in view of *Burns* (U.S. 6,141,374).

With regards to the rejection of Claims 2-20 and 22-30, as indicated above, these claims have been cancelled without prejudice. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims is moot.

With regard to amended Claims 1 and 21, and new Claims 31-53, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentably distinct from *Dahlman* in view of *Burns*. Further, it is respectfully submitted that there no motivation nor would it have been obvious to add the matched filter vectors of *Burns*, i.e., the alleged secondary sequence, with a second m-sequence to produce a secondary scrambling code.

As indicated by the Examiner in col. 5, lines 3-17, *Dahlman* requires a second scrambling code for supporting a compressed mode and discloses the structure generating the second scrambling code by setting a shift register value. Further, in col. 5, lines 18-27, *Dahlman* discloses a structure for processing a signal by using a channelization code and a scrambling code plus another code, instead of a method for using a second scrambling code. Accordingly, the description disclosed in col. 5, lines 18-27 of *Dahlman* is not related to the present invention, i.e., managing a scrambling code (the relationship between scrambling codes) and a method for assigning a scrambling code. Further, although the description disclosed in col. 5, lines 3-17 of *Dahlman* discloses a concept of a second scrambling code

(or a secondary scrambling code), the description of *Dahlman* fails to disclose the subject matter of the present invention of managing a scrambling code, i.e., relationship between scrambling codes, and a method for assigning a scrambling code.

As indicated by the Examiner in col. 3, *Burns* discloses a concept of a masking process, but this method for managing a scrambling code is different from the method for managing a scrambling code, i.e., relationship between scrambling codes, and a method for assigning a scrambling code as recited in the present application. More specifically, col. 3 of *Burns* discloses a method for managing a scrambling code in IS-95 or CDMA 2000. As in col. 3, lines 4-20 of *Burns*, all base stations use an identical PN code (or a scrambling code), but a unique shift offset for each base station is applied to the PN code. Accordingly, col. 3 of *Burns* generates a local PN code identically used by all base stations, and then performs masking for applying a unique offset to the local PN code for each base station.

However, in the present invention, the masking is applied to an m-sequence, not to the generated PN code (scrambling code), which is distinguishable from *Burns*. Further, it is respectfully submitted that *Burns* fails to disclose a method for managing a scrambling code, which is the subject matter of the present invention.

For example, Claim 1 of the present invention discloses "...the masking step is adapted to shift the first m-sequence cyclically by L chips to generate an Lth secondary scrambling code associated with the primary scrambling code", which it is respectfully submitted, is clearly patentably distinct from the masking process of *Burns*.

For at least the reasons given above, it is respectfully submitted that new independent Claims 48 and 51 are also patentably distinct from *Dahlman* in view of *Burns*.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely, Claims 1, 21, and 31-53, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", is written over a horizontal line.

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516
PJF/DMO/lah